

IN THE DRAWINGS

The Applicants acknowledge that the drawings have been accepted.

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are still pending in the present patent application.

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate that the Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite regarding the term "UTOPIA". Applicants have amended independent claim 13 which claims 14-24 depend and claim 28, wherein the term "UTOPIA" is expanded upon such that there are no remaining issues as to the clarity of these claims. Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection is now moot and that claims 13-24 are allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5, 25-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,412,783 (*Skokan*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Skokan* does not teach, disclose, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 of the present invention. Simply because *Skokan* discloses a handshaking signal, it does not follow that a handshaking unit that is coupled to the control line so the bus called for by claim 1 of the present invention is disclosed or made obvious. *Skokan* discloses an asynchronous handshake signal being encoded to facilitate transfer of the asynchronous handshake signal from a first network segment to a second network segment. *Skokan* discloses a network bus segment 10 and a network bus segment 30 being interconnected by a network extender 40. The network bus segment 10 is associated with one portion of a network and it communicates with the network bus segment 30 associated, which is associated with another portion of the network via a network extender 40. See column 3, lines 28-34. *Skokan* discloses that timing signals may be transmitted on various data lines 11 on each of the network bus

segments 10, 30, which may include a handshaking signal. See column 3, lines 33-37. *Skokan* also discloses that the timing signals 12 are sent on a separate line; wherein the timing signal includes the handshaking signals. *Id.* *Skokan* discloses that the bus segment 10 contains separate control lines 13, on which the handshaking signals are not sent. See column 3, lines 35-43. Therefore, it is abundantly clear from *Skokan* that the handshaking signals are not coupled to the control lines since the handshaking signal is part of the timing signals on the line 12. In other words, *Skokan* discloses that the control lines are on a separate line 13 and the handshaking signal is on another line (*i.e.*, data lines 11). See column 3, lines 34-41. In contrast to *Skokan*, the handshaking unit of claim 1 is coupled to the control lines of the bus. Therefore, *Skokan* directs one away from the subject matter of claim 1. *Skokan* simply does not disclose a handshaking unit being coupled to the control lines of the bus as called for by claim 1 of the present invention.

Additionally, *Skokan* clearly does not disclose a handshaking unit, as called for by claim 1 of the present invention. *Skokan* merely discloses that the timing signals on the data line 11 may include a handshaking signal, wherein claim 1 calls for a handshaking unit to be coupled to the control lines of the bus upon which a first device and a second device are coupled, which is clearly not disclosed or suggested by *Skokan*. *Skokan* does not disclose a handshaking unit, much less a handshaking unit providing a handshaking signal on a control line of a bus.

Furthermore, claim 1 calls for the first and second device being coupled to a bus, where a handshaking is coupled to the control lines of the bus to determine if the first and second devices are capable of completing a data transfer and enabling the first and second devices to facilitate the data transfer. *Skokan* clearly does not teach a handshaking unit capable of enabling the first and second devices to facilitate the data transfer. Upon close examination of *Skokan*, it is

revealed that there is no handshaking unit. Further, the handshaking signal, along with the timing signal, are sent to a coding device 14 and 15 and then converted to a serial stream using the serializer 19. The serial stream is then converted by deserializer 43, and then decoded by the decoders 34 and 35. See Figure 2, column 3, lines 60-68. In contrast to *Skokan*, the present invention overcomes some of the disadvantages of the subject matter of *Skokan*. For example, in the background section of the present invention, it is disclosed that one limitation of the prior art multiple physical device arrangement is that there is no efficient capability of providing direct communication between physical devices on the bus. See page 3, lines 19-20 of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that *Skokan* falls in this category since coding, converting data to a serial stream, deserializing, and decoding are required for communication, wherein many of these disadvantages are overcome by the handshaking unit being coupled to the control lines of the bus that interconnects a first device and a second device, where enabling of data transfer between the first device and the second device may be facilitated by the handshaking unit. Therefore, some of the disadvantages of *Skokan* are overcome by the present invention, although the claims are not limited as such. Hence, various disadvantages of *Skokan* may be overcome by employing various features of the present invention. Accordingly, those skilled in the art would not be taught the subject matter of various elements of the present invention. Therefore, *Skokan* does not teach, disclose, or suggest all of the elements of the present invention.

In addition, as described above, *Skokan* clearly does not disclose a handshaking unit coupled to the control lines of the bus interconnecting the first and second devices. Furthermore, *Skokan* actually teaches away from the subject matter of the claims, since the handshaking signals in *Skokan*, along with the other timing signals, are on data lines (i.e., line 12), wherein the

control lines are on line 13, which is a separate line. However, other factors, such as the lack of a handshaking unit being coupled to the control lines of the bus, which is capable of enabling the first and second devices to facilitate the data transfer, is clearly not taught, disclosed or suggested by *Skokan*. Therefore, all of the elements of claim 1 of the present invention are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by *Skokan*, and therefore, claim 1 of the present invention is allowable for at least the reasons cited herein.

Furthermore, claim 13, which calls for a communications system that includes a BUS being connected to a first and a second device, as well as a handshaking unit coupled to the BUS to facilitate a data transfer between the first and second devices, is also not anticipated by *Skokan* for at least the reasons cited above. Additionally, claim 25, which calls for determining if the first and second devices are capable of completing a data transfer, providing handshaking signals to enable the first and second devices, and transferring the data in response to the handshaking signals, is also not anticipated by *Skokan* for at least the reasons cited above. Therefore, independent claims 1, 13, and 25 of the present invention are allowable for at least the reasons provided herein.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, and 26-35, which depend from independent claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively are also now considered to be patentable in light of the above-presented arguments.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Skokan*, as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 25-27 and 29 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,376 (*Rumer*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of *Skokan* and *Rumer* do not suggest, teach, or make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. The Examiner stated that *Skokan* did not explicitly mention UTOPIA interfaces and uses *Rumer* to make obvious the UTOPIA interfaces. However, as described above, *Skokan* is missing much more than the UTOPIA interfaces, therefore, merely adding the UTOPIA interface of *Rumer*, still does not teach, disclose, or suggest all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35, which depend from the independent claims that have elements clearly not disclosed by *Skokan* (as described above), *Rumer*, and/or their combination. *Rumer* merely discloses a communication bus snooper switch to receive ATM cells from a number of ATM physical layer interfaces across a common inbound bus. *Rumer* clearly does not disclose or make obvious various elements, such as the handshaking unit coupled to the control lines of the bus that interconnects the first and second devices, which as described above, is also not disclosed by *Skokan*. *Rumer* does not make for the deficit of *Skokan*. Therefore, the combination of *Skokan* and *Rumer* do not disclose or make obvious various elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention.


Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is insufficient motivation in *Skokan* and/or *Rumer* to prompt one skilled in the art to combine the prior art disclosures to make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. In other words, the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence or arguments to illustrate that sufficient motivation is found within the cited prior art that would direct one of those skilled in the art to modify the prior art to make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. For example, *Skokan* is directed to an asynchronous handshake signal being encoded to facilitate transfer of the handshake signal from a first network segment to a

second network segment. In contrast, *Rumer* is directed to an ATM UTOPIA bus snooper switch that is capable of receiving queue of the number of available slots corresponding to the physical layers of the ATM interfaces. See col. 3, lines 40-46 and col. 4, lines 39-48. Those skilled in the art would not be motivated by these disclosures to combine them to make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. The Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence or arguments to the contrary. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that those skilled in the art would not have combined *Rumer* and *Skokan* to make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. Furthermore, as described above, *arguendo* even if *Rumer* and *Skokan* were combined, their combination still would not make obvious all of the elements of claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention. Therefore, claims 4, 6-24, 28 and 30-35 of the present invention, are allowable for at least the reasons cited herein.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In addition, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-35 are allowable. In light of the arguments presented above, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4069 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

<p>Date: <u>September 14, 2005</u></p>	<p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. CUSTOMER NO. 23720</p> <p>By: </p> <p>Jaison C. John, Reg. 50,737 10333 Richmond, Suite 1100 Houston, Texas 77042 (713) 934-7000 (713) 934-7011 (facsimile) ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)</p>
--	--